

1 KEVIN G. LITTLE, SBN 149818
ATTORNEY AT LAW
2 6083 N. Figarden Drive, No. 188
Fresno, California 93722
3 Telephone: (559) 708-4750
E-mail: fwllaw@aol.com

Attorney for Plaintiff Daniel E. Ruff

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

DANIEL E. RUFF,
Plaintiff,
v.
COUNTY OF KINGS, ETC.,
Defendant

Case No. CV-F-05-0631 OWW GSA
ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S MOTION IN
LIMINE

On September 4, 2009, the above-entitled matter came before the Court for hearing and decision on the plaintiff's initial and additional motions in limine (Dkt. Nos. 116 and 128). After considering the parties' pertinent pleadings and oral argument, the Court hereby rules upon said motions as follows:

1. Plaintiff's first initial motion in limine is withdrawn without prejudice to its being renewed as appropriate.
 2. Plaintiff's second initial motion in limine is granted as requested.
 3. Plaintiff's third initial motion in limine is granted as requested.
 4. Plaintiff's fourth initial motion in limine is granted as requested.
 5. Plaintiff's fifth initial motion in limine is granted as requested.
 6. Plaintiff's sixth initial motion in limine is granted as requested.

7. Plaintiff's seventh motion in limine is granted as to impeachment evidence not otherwise produced as discovery and denied as to impeachment evidence produced during discovery.
 8. Plaintiff's first additional motion in limine is denied without prejudice to its being renewed as appropriate.
 9. Plaintiff's second additional motion in limine is granted as requested subject to a reservation, i.e., that defense expert witnesses may address issues other than those cited for denying plaintiff's site plan review application to the extent necessary to rebut testimony adduced by plaintiff's experts.
 10. Plaintiff's third additional motion in limine is granted as requested.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 14, 2009

/s/ Oliver W. Wanger

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE